

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATI RECEIVED SUSAN BITTER SMITH Chairman 2015 JUL 22 A 8: 45 3 **BOB STUMP** Commissioner 4 AZ CORP COMMISSIO A DOCKET CONTROL **BOB BURNS** Commissioner 5 DOUG LITTLE Commissioner ORIGINAL 6 TOM FORESE Commissioner 7 IN THE MATTER OF COMMISSION PIPELINE DOCKET NO. G-20923A-15-0030 SAFETY SECTION STAFF'S COMPLAINT AGAINST DESERT GAS, LP FOR VIOLATIONS **NOTICE OF FILING** OF COMMISSION RULES. STAFF DIRECT TESTIMONY 10 11 Staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Staff") hereby files the Direct Testimony of 12 Robert E. Miller, in the above referenced docket 13 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2015. 14 15 16 Charles H. Hains 17 Attorney, Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission 18 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 19 (602) 542-3402 20 The original and thirteen (13) copies of the foregoing were filed this 21 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2015 with: Arizona Corporation Commission 22 DOCKETED **Docket Control** Arizona Corporation Commission 23 JUL 2 2 2015 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007 24 DOCKETED BY 25 26 27

28

2	22 <sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2015 to:
3	Bret Bartholomey Desert Gas, LP
4	1709 Utica Square – 240 Tulsa, OK 74114
5	Will Raymond Lateneni, Flesident
6	1702 Office Square = 240
7	
8	Breetor, Sarcty Division
9	2200 North Central Avenue, Suite #300
10	Phoenix, AZ 85004  Jason D. Gellman
11	Snell & Wilmer, LLP
12	One Arizona Center 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 1900
13	Phoenix, Arizona 85004 Attorney for Desert Gas, LP
14	land best out, in
15	Broseann Osprio
16	Froseann Osorio
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

# BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

SUSAN BITTER SMITH Chairman BOB STUMP Commissioner BOB BURNS Commissioner DOUG LITTLE Commissioner TOM FORESE			
IN THE MATTER OF COMMISSION PIPELINE ) SAFETY SECTION STAFF'S COMPLAINT ) AGAINST DESERT GAS, LP FOR VIOLATIONS) OF COMMISSION RULES )	DOCKET NO. G-20923A-15-0030		
TESTIMONY			
SUPPORTING THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT			
OF			
ROBERT E. MILLER			
PIPELINE SAFETY SECTION MANAGER			
SAFETY DIVISION			
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION			

JULY 22, 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY STAFF'S COMPLAINT AGAINST DESERT GAS, LP DOCKET NO. G-20923A-15-0030

This testimony addresses Staff's view of the Settlement Agreement reached between Staff and Desert Gas, LP to resolve all issues surrounding the Staff Complaint.

Testimony Supporting the Settlement Agreement of Robert Miller Docket No. E-20923A-15-0030 Page 1

# 

#### INTRODUCTION:

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. Robert E Miller, 2200 North Central Avenue Suite 300 85004

## Q. By whom and in what capacity are you employed?

A. I am employed by the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") as the Program Manager of the Pipeline Safety Section.

## Q. Please state your pertinent work experience.

A. From 1969 to 1996, I was employed in the pipeline construction industry in various

capacities beginning as labor and advancing to General Manager of Pipeline construction

for companies specializing in regulated pipeline construction and maintenance.

From November 1996 to April 2006, I served as pipeline safety inspector for the

Commission.

In 2006, I was promoted to Program Manager of the Pipeline Safety Section. My primary duties as Program Manager include managing the day to day operations of the Pipeline Safety Section, assuring the quality and accuracy of all pipeline safety inspections conducted and verifying the factual information contained in inspection reports generated by Staff and assuring that Staff adhere to all established policies and procedures in the execution of their duties.

Testimony Supporting the Settlement Agreement of Robert Miller Docket No. E-20923A-15-0030 Page 2

#### **PURPOSE:**

- Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
- A. The purpose of my testimony is to support the proposed settlement agreement ("agreement") between the Commission and Desert Gas, LP ("DG"). I will also provide testimony to the public interest benefits.

Q. Did you participate in the negotiations that led to the execution of the Agreement?

- A. Yes, I did.
  - Q. Were the Signatories able to resolve all issues?
- 11 A. Yes, they were.

Q. How would you describe the negotiations?

- A. I would characterizes the negotiations as being open, transparent and cooperative with all parties having the opportunity to raise, discuss and propose resolutions to any issue they desired.
- Q. Would you describe the process as requiring give and take?
- A. Yes, both parties negotiated their positions on how best to resolve the issues and come to the resolution in the Agreement.
- Q. Because of such compromising do you believe that the public interest was compromised?
- **A.** No, I do not.

## Q. What are the principal benefits of the Agreement from Staff's perspective?

A. This agreement addresses a number of issues that will serve to enhance and improve the safe operation of this facility, thereby providing an improved level of safety for those that are actively employed by DG and to the public in the vicinity of the DG facility. New policies and procedures have been initiated to prevent a recurrence of the issues that resulted in this action being taken. Additionally, communications between the operator and Staff have improved as a result of the agreement. The operator of this facility has and will be continuing to contact Commission Staff prior to commencing new construction to assure compliance with regulations and to schedule inspections of the work by Commission Staff.

## Q. Please describe Part 1 of the Agreement.

A. Part 1, Testing of Welds, requires DG to cease operations of the methane compressor until 100 percent of all welds have been radiographed and the system has been pressure tested.

At this time DG has voluntarily complied fully with this section of the Agreement.

## Q. Please describe Part 2 of the Agreement.

A. Part 2, Additional Staffing, requires DG to retain a trained and qualified welding inspector to ensure that all future welding at the DG facility meets all regulatory requirements.

## Q. Please describe Part 3 of the Agreement.

A. Part 3, Future Testing of Welds, requires DG to test all future welds at the facility and to notify Commission Staff no less than 72 hours prior to the testing taking place.

#### Q. Please describe Part 4 of the Agreement.

A. Part 4, Procedures Regarding Future Welding, requires DG to develop written procedures for all future work involving additions to the DG facility and assure that all contractors and welders have necessary training and qualifications to execute the written the procedure.

DG further agrees to make notification to the Commission no less than ten days prior to any welding taking place and to provide copies of all welding procedures and welder qualifications to the Commission.

#### Q. Please describe Part 5 of the Agreement.

A. Pursuant to Part 5, Safety Management System ("SMS"), DG agrees to establish a formal process for the implementation of a SMS program following the guidance established in the American Petroleum Institute Recommended Practice 1173 ("API-1173"). DG agrees to establish a safety office at their facility dedicated to implementation of the SMS program. In keeping with the API-1173 guidance, DG shall hold quarterly and annual meetings that shall include DG's Chief Executive Officer, management staff and DG employees. DG shall also conduct annual reviews of the SMS program at which Commission Staff shall have the opportunity to participate. DG shall also establish a written safety manual appropriate to the DG facility. Records of all SMS meetings and reviews shall be maintained for the life of the system.

A.

Q.

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

Please describe Part 6 of the Agreement. Q.

Pursuant to Part 6, Immediate Payment and Future Payment, DG agrees to make an immediate payment of \$7,500 to the Arizona General Fund and further agrees to make an additional payment of \$42,500 should DG be found to have not complied with the terms of the Agreement within the next 5 years.

Mr. Miller, is the Agreement in the public interest?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Would you summarize the reasons that lead Staff to conclude that the Agreement is fair, balanced, and in the public interest?

A. This Agreement addresses all the issues identified in the original Staff Complaint filed against DG and increases the level of operational safety at this facility going forward. Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 all meet or exceed current regulatory requirements and will serve to enhance pipeline and public safety. Payment of a \$7,500 civil penalty coupled with a potential civil penalty of \$42,500 serve as an appropriate deterrent to any future violations.

- Is there anything else you would like to add to your testimony? Q.
- Α. No, there is not.
- O. Does this conclude your testimony?
- A. Yes.